

implementing a programmable stall clock. Applicant strenuously disagrees that the Taraci frame rate delay is the same as the claimed programmable stall clock.

The Crump reference is directed to video refresh technique that reduces complications between different video formats. The Kondoh reference is directed to a technique for data queuing. Neither of these references teaches or suggests a programmable stall clock.

Under the Graham analysis, the scope and content of the Taraci reference is different than the presently claimed invention. There are significant differences between the Taraci reference and the presently claimed invention. Finally, there is simply no suggestion in the references to combine them in a manner that would result in the presently claimed invention.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that the Taraci reference in combination with the Crump or Kondoh references does not teach or suggest the claimed invention, and therefore, cannot serve as a §103 references to reject claims 4, 5, 7 and 8.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above, Applicant requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejections and pass the claims to issue.

If any matters can be resolved by telephone, Applicant requests that the Patent and Trademark Office call the Applicant at the telephone number listed below.

IP Strategy Group (IPSG, P.C.)
10121 Miller Ave, Suite 201
Cupertino, CA 95014
Tel: 408-257-5500
Fax: 408-257-5550

Respectfully submitted,

By: DAVID ASHBY
David C. Ashby
Reg. No. 36,432

Amendment After Final
PHIL-P008

3

Ser. No. 09/920,042
NL010506